

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner noted that Applicants' reply of February 1, 2006 had been carefully considered. However, the Examiner went on to maintain the argument that many of these submitted amendments amount to "new matter". In order to facilitate further examination, and without prejudice, Applicants are effectively withdrawing all the amendments that the Examiner argues amount to "new matter".

Thus, the counterparts to the claims in the Summary of the Invention have been amended to delete reference to a second common coolant supply and associated second temperature control circuits, etc. Independent claims 1 and 28 have amended correspondingly by deleting the final paragraph of each claim which introduced these same features.

As a result of these amendments, there are some minor, consequential amendments in other claims. Thus, claim 18 is being deleted; the reference to the second temperature control circuit is being deleted from claim 21; the dependency of claim 22 is being amended to refer, in the alternative to claims 1, 12 or 21.

It is submitted that these amendments, fundamentally, address all the issue outstanding in the Office Action. For completeness, the Examiner's individual points are addressed below.

The Examiner had objected to the previously submitted amendment under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) on the grounds that it introduces new matter. The Examiner had required the Applicants to cancel this new matter. As detailed above, since the relevant passages, as identified in the last full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, have now been deleted, it is submitted that this objection has been overcome.

The Examiner went on to reject claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 18, 21-22 and 28-30 as failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112. The Examiner argued that the claims contained subject matter which was not described in the specification in such as way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, the Examiner argued that no second common coolant supply was originally shown for cooling circuits for the heat exchangers 118a and 126a. As detailed above, the claims are being amended so that they no longer cover this arrangement.

The Examiner had noted that claims 23-27 were allowed, and further had noted that claims 1 and 28 would be allowable if the last paragraph in each of these claims was cancelled; a corresponding amendment to the specification would likewise address the "new matter" objection.

As claims 1 and 28 have now been amended by cancellation of the final paragraph in each claim, it is submitted that these claims are now in order for allowance. Further, the corresponding passages in the specification have been brought into agreement with these amended claims, i.e. by deleting the relevant paragraphs so that again it is submitted that the "new matter" objection has been overcome.

It is submitted that the application is in order for allowance, and early review and allowance are requested. If there are any outstanding issues, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By 

H. Samuel Frost
Reg. No. 31,696
Tel: 416-364-7311